1 2 3 4 5 6	Keith G. Bremer, State Bar No. 155920 kbremer@bremerwhyte.com Benjamin Price, State Bar No. 267400 bprice@bremerwhyte.com BREMER WHYTE BROWN & O'MEARA LLP 20320 S.W. Birch Street Second Floor Newport Beach, California 92660 Telephone: (949) 221-1000 Facsimile: (949) 221-1001			
7	B.I.G. ENTERPRISES, a California corporation			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	DIO ENTERRIPEDICE - California	) Case No. '15CV2635 BTM WVG		
11	B.I.G. ENTERPRISES, a California corporation,	)		
12	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR:		
13	VS.	1. COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT		
14	SELECT ELECTRIC, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,	2. CONVERSION		
15	inclusive,	) 3. UNFAIR COMPETITION IN ) VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA		
16	Defendants.	) BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS ) CODE SECTION 17200		
17		4. DECLARATORY RELIEF		
18				
19	PLAINTIFF B.I.G. ENTERPRISES (*	PLAINTIFF ) lieteby alleges as		
20	follows:			
21 22	THE PARTIES  1 PLAINTIES is and at all times berein mentioned was a California			
23	1. PLAINTIFF is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a California corporation authorized to conduct business in the State of California, with its			
24	principal place of business located in Los Angeles County, State of California.			
25	2. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that SELECT			
26	ELECTRIC, INC. ("DEFENDANT") is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a			
27	California corporation authorized to conduct business in the State of California, with			
28	its principal place of business located in San Diego County, State of California.			
ROWN &	no principal place of duciness recalls in sun	Diego county, state of currental		

BREMER WHYTE BROWN & O'MEARA LLP 20320 S.W. BIRCH STREET SECOND FLOOR NEWPORT BCH, CA 92660 (949) 221-1000

8

10

9

11

13

14 15

16

17

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

27

28

- 3. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, or otherwise, of Defendants DOES 1 through 100 inclusive are unknown to PLAINTIFF, who therefore sues such defendants by fictitious names, and PLAINTIFF will amend this Complaint to show their true names and capacities when they have been ascertained.
- 4. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that all Defendants including the DOE defendants, are in some way responsible for the matters complained of herein.
- PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that at 5. all times relevant herein, each and every named and fictitiously named defendant herein, was the agent, employee or joint venturer of each of the other remaining defendants, and in doing the things herein alleged, acted within the scope, capacity, authorization and direction of each of the remaining defendants, while in defendants' employ, agency or joint venture.

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This Court has jurisdiction of this action under 28 U.S.C. sections 1331 and 1338 because this action arises under the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101 et. seq. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. section 1400(a) because Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this District.

# FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 7. PLAINTIFF is a premier manufacturer of security and revenue control booths.
- 8. DEFENDANT specializes in construction of transportation infrastructure projects.
- 9. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that DEFENDANT has been awarded a contract to provide certain construction services relating to the project known as the SR-91 Corridor Improvement Project.

PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that included within the

8

11

12

13

10

14 15

17

19 20

22

23

21

24

25 26

27

28

services DEFENDANT agreed to provide is the design and construction of two Manned Toll Utility Buildings ("TUB").

- 10. In the summer of 2014, PLAINTIFF and DEFENDANT discussed the possibility of PLAINTIFF constructing the TUB buildings. On or about July 18, 2014, DEFENDANT submitted a letter of intent correspondence to PLAINTIFF in which DEFENDANT stated that upon creation of a final design DEFENDANT would issue a formal purchase order for the construction of the TUB buildings.
- At the time, PLAINTIFF indicated its interest in providing the design and construction services based on the general scope of work communicated by DEFENDANT to PLAINTIFF.
- 12. Over the next several months after the letter of intent was sent by DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF submitted a series of drawings and plans for the construction of the TUB buildings. Once those plans were nearly final and were formally submitted to DEFENDANT, they were approved by the first design professional that reviewed them. Not content with this approval, DEFENDANT 16 requested that a second design professional approve the plans. When this was done, DEFENDANT then requested that a third design professional approve the plans, this time a design professional of DEFENDANT's choosing. When the review by the third design professional was completed, the third design professional had requested dramatic changes to the plans which far exceeded the scope of the work originally described by DEFENDANT. When these changes were reported to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF promptly advised the revised scope of work exceeded PLAINTIFF's capabilities and PLAINTIFF could not work towards completion of a contract with that revised scope of work.
  - 13. The copyright as to the plans created and submitted by PLAINTIFF to DEFENDANT relating to the TUB buildings is owned by PLAINTIFF. Notwithstanding the same, on September 24, 2015 DEFENDANT advised PLAINTIFF it would be using the plans with or without PLAINTIFF's consent.

PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANT has been using PLAINTIFF's plans to work towards construction of the TUB buildings either on its own or with the help of third party subcontractors.

14. DEFENDANT's infringing conduct has deprived PLAINTIFF of the benefits of ownership of the copyright of the plans, and has caused or will continue to cause irreparable harm to PLAINTIFF unless DEFENDANT's conduct is enjoined.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

### (Copyright Infringement – As to All Defendants)

- 15. PLAINTIFF repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 14, inclusive, and incorporates the same as though set forth in full herein.
- 16. DEFENDANT has knowingly and willfully directly copied and reproduced the plans to construct the TUB buildings for its own commercial purposes.
- 17. DEFENDANT did not obtain written permission or any license from PLAINTIFF for the reproduction and distribution of the plans.
- 18. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that DEFENDANT's infringing acts have been performed with knowledge of PLAINTIFF's copyrights and that such acts were committed intentionally and willfully.
- 19. By reason of DEFENDANT's willful infringement of PLAINTIFF's copyrights, PLAINTIFF has suffered substantial injury, loss, and damage in an amount to be proven at trial and DEFENDANT has unlawfully and wrongfully derived and will continue to derive income from its infringing acts.
- 20. If DEFENDANT's wrongful unauthorized use and distribution of the plans continues, PLAINTIFF will continue to suffer irreparable harm of a continuing nature for which there is no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

# 

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

# (Unfair Competition in Violation of California Business and Professions Code Section 17200 – As to All Defendants)

- 29. PLAINTIFF repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 28, inclusive, and incorporates the same as though set forth in full herein.
- 30. The California Unfair Business Practices Act defines unfair business competition to include any "unlawful" or "fraudulent" business act or practice.
- 31. As described herein, PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that the DEFENDANT is using PLAINTIFF's plans for the construction of the TUB buildings in violation of the Copyright Act.
- 32. DEFENDANT's acts and practices described herein constitute unfair and unlawful business acts and practices within the meaning of the California Unfair Business Practices Act as DEFENDANT's acts and practices herein described offend established public policy, because the harm they cause to consumers outweighs any benefits associated with those practices, and because the acts mislead consumers.
- 33. As a result of DEFENDANT's unfair business practices, PLAINTIFF is entitled to injunctive relief, restitution, and disgorgement of profits obtained by DEFENDANT as a result of its unfair business acts and practices.

# **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

# (Declaratory Relief - As to All Defendants)

- 34. PLAINTIFF repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 33, inclusive, and incorporates the same as though set forth in full herein.
- 35. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between PLAINTIFF and DEFENDANT regarding (i) whether DEFENDANT may use PLAINTIFF's plans for construction of the TUB buildings without PLAINTIFF's consent, (ii) whether PLAINTIFF and DEFENDANT have a contractual relationship whereby

- 1			
1	43.	For attorney's fees pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505;	
2	44.	For all costs of suit incurred herein, if appropriate; and	
3	45.	For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper	
4	ON THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:		
5	46.	For general and incidental damages in an amount to be proven at the	
6	time of trial;		
7	47.	For prejudgment and post-judgment interest in the maximum amount	
8	allowed by law;		
9	48.	For punitive and exemplary damages;	
10	49.	For all costs of suit incurred herein, if appropriate; and	
11	50.	For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper	
12	ON THE THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:		
13	51.	For restitution;	
14	52.	For disgorgement of profits;	
15	53.	For injunctive relief, including temporary, preliminary, and permanent	
16	injunctive relief, preventing Defendants from the unlawful conduct as described		
17	herein;		
18	54.	For prejudgment and post-judgment interest in the maximum amount	
19	allowed by law;		
20	55.	For all costs of suit incurred herein, if appropriate; and	
21	56.	For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper	
22	ON THE FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION:		
23	57.	For a declaration that DEFENDANT may not use PLAINTIFF's plans	
24	for construction of the TUB buildings without PLAINTIFF's consent;		
25	58.	For a declaration that PLAINTIFF and DEFENDANT have no	
26	contractual relationship whereby PLAINTIFF is obligated to construct the TUB		
27	buildings at issue;		
28	111		

1	59.	For a declaration that PLAINTIFF is not in breach of any contractual	
2	relationship by not constructing the TUB buildings at issue with the scope of work		
3	expanded by DEFENDANT;		
4	60.	0. For prejudgment and post-judgment interest in the maximum amount	
5	allowed by law;		
6	61.	61. For all costs of suit incurred herein, if appropriate; and	
7	62.	For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper	
8	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
9	PLAINTIFF hereby demands a trial by jury.		
10	Dated: No	vember 23, 2015	
11		BREMER WHYTE BROWN & O'MEARA LLP	
12			
13		By: /s/ Benjamin L. Price	
14		Keith G. Bremer Benjamin Price	
15		Attorneys for Plaintiff B.I.G. ENTERPRISES, a California	
16		corporation	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

BREMER WHYTE BROWN & O'MEARA LLP 20320 S.W. BIRCH STREET SECOND FLOOR NEWPORT BCH, CA 92660 (949) 221-1000